1	BEFORE THE								
2	ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMM	4ISS	ION						
3	John Oleson)							
4	-VS-)	No. 12-0483						
5	Aqua Illinois, Inc.)							
6)							
7	Complaint as to billing/charges)							
8	in Mundelein, Illinois)							
9									
10	Chicago, Illinois								
11	September 20th, 2012								
12									
13	Met, pursuant to adjournment,	, at	11:00 a.m.						
14	BEFORE:								
	Mr. John T. Riley, Administrative	Law	Judge						
15									
	APPEARANCES:								
16	SPESIA & AYERS, P.C., by								
	CHRISTIAN SPESIA								
17	1415 BLACK ROAD								
	JOLIET, IL 60435								
18	(815) 726-4311								
	for Aqua Illinois, Ind	С.,							
19									
	JOHN OLESON								
20	28669 N. THORNGATE DR								
	MUNDELEIN, IL 60060								
21									
	L.A. COURT REPORTERS, by.								
22	Kari Wiedenhaupt, CSR, License No.	. 08	4-004725						

1						
2		I N D E X				
3				Re	Re	Ву
	WITNESSES:	Direct	Cross	Direct	Cross	Examiner
4						
	(None.)					
5						
6						
7						
8						
9		ЕХНІЕ	BITS	S		
	NUMBER	MARKED FOR	ID	IN EV	IDENCE	
10	STAFF					
11	(None.)					
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						

- JUDGE RILEY: Pursuant to the direction of the
- 2 Illinois Commerce Commission, I call Docket 12-0483.
- This is a complaint by John Oleson versus Aqua
- 4 Illinois, Inc., as to billing and charges in
- Mundelein, Illinois. And Mr. Oleson, I understand
- that you are proceeding without counsel at this
- point; is that correct?
- 8 MR. OLESON: Yes.
- 9 JUDGE RILEY: Okay. Just to advise you that
- you can have an attorney appear on your behalf at any
- time during this proceeding, but they would have to
- take the record as they find it. We would not be
- able to go back and start over.
- MR. OLESON: I understand.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Spesia, would you enter an
- appearance for the record, stating your name and
- office address?
- MR. SPESIA: Yeah. Christian Spesia,
- 19 S-P-E-S-I-A, office address, 1415 Black Road, Joliet,
- Illinois, 60435, appearing on the behalf of Aqua
- 21 Illinois, Inc.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Oleson, just to recap, you

- are objecting in your complaint to overcharging for
- water customer charges and for fire protection
- 3 charges. In both you allege that there were two
- 4 meters involved?
- MR. OLESON: Yes.
- JUDGE RILEY: Can you explain a little more
- thoroughly for my understanding what is actually
- 8 going on?
- 9 MR. OLESON: We built the house in 2005. The
- house was equipped with a single service line. A
- second meter was added to that same service line
- inside the house. I have photographs of the meter
- setup that I will be glad to provide. So we have
- two meters. One goes for inside household use only.
- The other meter goes for outside use, including
- irrigation and house -- and the hose spigots on the
- outside.
- JUDGE RILEY: And do you have any idea why
- there are two meters?
- MR. OLESON: I put in two meters at my request,
- 21 and Aqua furnished the second meter to us. We paid
- all the connection charges that were required for

- water and sewer when the house was under
- construction, and Aqua provided the -- both meters.
- ³ They were installed. They have been inspected by
- ⁴ Aqua personnel to see, to verify how they are
- installed, and the installation of the second meter
- 6 was to avoid sewage charges on water delivered to the
- house that -- water that went to the outside.
- MR. MELTON: It does not go to the sanitary
- 9 sewer.
- JUDGE RILEY: One thing. You said you were Mr.
- Oleson's associate?
- MR. MELTON: Yes.
- JUDGE RILEY: Could you state your name?
- MR. MELTON: I'm Mr. Melton.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Melton?
- MR. MELTON: Yes, M-E-L-T-O-N.
- JUDGE RILEY: All right. I have got to let Mr.
- Oleson run with the ball here. You can confer with
- 19 him if you want.
- MR. OLESON: I would appreciate that. He is in
- the same exact circumstance that I am in.
- JUDGE RILEY: Okay. But this is your

- 1 complaint.
- MR. OLESON: I understand.
- JUDGE RILEY: Right. He would have to file a
- 4 separate complaint if he wanted to obtain relief, but
- what -- what is contrary to the filed tariff?
- 6 MR. OLESON: Contrary to the filed tariff is
- ⁷ the charges. We are being charged a second full fire
- 8 protection charge on the second meter. My grass does
- 9 not need a second fire protection charge. No
- additional equipment is installed by Aqua Illinois to
- provide any kind of fire protection. No changes were
- made because I put in a second meter. Yet I am being
- charged \$16.60 per month forever as long as that
- meter is activated, and it's not in their tariff. It
- specifically does not say that it is an authorized
- 16 charge in the tariff.
- JUDGE RILEY: And this applies to both the
- water customer charges and the fire protection
- 19 charges?
- MR. OLESON: It applies to the fire protection
- charge. There is two different issues. One is the
- issue of having two meters and the charging of the

- service charge for the meters. The other is a fire
- protection charge, which we never had before and has
- now been added, but instead of my neighbor -- not
- 4 Stuart here, but my neighbor, has a single meter.
- 5 They are charged one fire protection charge. Because
- a second meter has been -- has been put in on my
- y system, I am being charged by Aqua another 16.60 per
- 8 month for that fire protection charge, and that's not
- ⁹ in their tariff.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Spesia, what is Aqua's
- 11 response to all of this?
- MR. SPESIA: Well, Judge, on the fire
- protection charge, I think there is some support for
- it in the tariffs, but similar to the last case that
- we talked about, what I would propose for all these
- matters is if we can put this over, a representative
- from Agua, Craig Blanchette (phonetic) -- I've
- actually had a chance to talk to him -- would like to
- come out and sit with Mr. Oleson and go over his
- various concerns. Frankly, I think a couple of these
- issues could be resolved.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Oleson, would that be -- are

- 1 you amenable to that?
- MR. OLESON: I have talked to customer service
- 3 at Aqua and was unable to resolve these issues. I
- 4 attended a meeting at Hawthorn Woods called by the
- 5 Hawthorn Woods mayor. Craig Blanchette appeared at
- that meeting, and he said at that meeting that Aqua
- might consider doing something, but it certainly is
- 8 not consideration of the many people in my
- ⁹ subdivision including Stuart, myself and perhaps as
- many as 20 others that are in this same circumstance.
- JUDGE RILEY: Well, as I said before, if there
- are others that are in the same circumstance, they
- are going to have to file their own complaints. We
- can only consider yours.
- MR. OLESON: However, if they are charging a
- second fire protection charge on my second meter, and
- they do this on other people's, how can they continue
- to do it on other people's? If it violates the
- tariff in my case, how can they continue to do it?
- How can the ICC allow them to continue to do it for
- other people?
- JUDGE RILEY: Well, it hasn't been brought to

- our attention. What Mr. Spesia is saying is that you
- can get a one-on-one meeting with Mr. Blanchette to
- possibly get a further explanation of this and
- 4 possibly a resolution.
- MR. SPESIA: Yeah. I think if you give him the
- opportunity at least to sit down and try to work
- ⁷ through a couple of these matters that it would make
- sense, I think, in the end to you. And I can't speak
- 9 for, you know, your other neighbors, et cetera, but I
- understand what you are saying.
- MR. OLESON: Is this an evidentiary hearing,
- and we are providing evidence?
- JUDGE RILEY: No. This was -- the notice
- specifically said it was a prehearing conference.
- MR. OLESON: All right. Because it's important
- that in an evidentiary hearing we can discuss the
- issues of what their tariff says and what is being
- applied on my specific bills. Unless we want to go
- into all of that detail, I don't think that this
- is -- meeting with Craig Blanchette is not going to
- resolve the issue unless he can change the tariff,
- 22 and unless he can force Aqua to change the way this

- is applied for myself.
- JUDGE RILEY: First of all, an evidentiary
- 3 hearing is not a discussion. It is a presentation of
- ⁴ evidence. This is the discussion now, the prehearing
- 5 conference, or if we wanted to do a subsequent status
- 6 after you have met with Mr. Blanchette, but what I
- was going to suggest is, why don't you give it one
- 8 more try with Mr. Blanchette, and if you are still
- 9 dissatisfied, you can have your day in court, and we
- can set this matter for a hearing.
- MR. OLESON: If when Mr. Blanchette were to
- appear with me he will actually look at the tariff,
- and be willing to tell Aqua whether they are -- their
- 14 interpretation of the tariff is wrong, when he -- the
- 15 way it is being applied for this second fire
- protection charge, et cetera, unless he has that
- capability --
- MR. SPESIA: Why don't I say it this way. I'm
- sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you. Mr.
- 20 Blanchette will certainly have authority to deal with
- these various issues. I'm not committing him to a
- position, but I am telling you that he will have

- ¹ authority.
- JUDGE RILEY: I think a large part of this
- 3 comes down to the interpretation of those tariffs and
- 4 what the language is, and I think that it would be
- beneficial to you to sort out that language with Mr.
- 6 Blanchette either to your satisfaction or not to your
- ⁷ satisfaction, but that would give you a better
- 8 understanding of just exactly what you are going to
- 9 bring into the evidentiary hearing. All I am saying
- is that I think it's worth one more attempt to meet
- with Mr. Blanchette on a one-on-one basis and see
- what he has to say about the tariffs.
- MR. OLESON: I have filed two informal
- complaints with the ICC because I was unable to
- obtain satisfaction in talking to customer service at
- Aqua. I am not sure that I haven't followed the
- requirements here, and I will be willing to meet with
- Mr. Blanchette, but this may not be -- it may not
- resolve the issue, and I want Mr. Blanchette to be
- aware of that fact, and in order to satisfy any kind
- of a discussion, he is going to have to provide
- service records for me for things when we meet, or I

- won't meet.
- MR. SPESIA: I don't understand what you are
- 3 saying about service records. Are you talking about
- 4 the backup to the billing statements that you have
- 5 issues with?
- 6 MR. OLESON: No. Specifically, I am talking
- about Aqua personnel have been in my home at least
- 8 three times, to my knowledge, over the period of time
- 9 since December of 2005 to verify the installation of
- my meters, and I want the service records of those
- inspections that were conducted inside my house so
- that I know what is being told to Aqua that is -- how
- my meters are installed, and if they are properly
- installed and so on.
- MR. SPESIA: I'm not sure what that has to do
- with your complaint.
- MR. OLESON: Well, it goes to another part. We
- talked about the fire protection charge. When you go
- back to the initial charge as far as meter operation,
- we get into the technical language of the tariff that
- was filed, and it appears that you have internal
- conflicts within the tariff filing pages between what

- is -- what is said as far as a water service charge.
- 2 Specifically, it says, A water service charge. I am
- being charged two water service charges, because I
- 4 have -- water customer service charges because I have
- 5 two meters.
- Now, the interpretation of the tariff
- is something that -- Aqua interprets their tariff to
- 8 their benefit. I don't see it that way. I am one
- 9 customer. I have one service line, and I have two
- meters.
- MR. SPESIA: All I can do is ask him if he
- would bring those records. I can't commit that he
- will bring them. I don't see that there would be a
- 14 problem with it, to bring service records. I think
- it's three times they have been in your house.
- MR. OLESON: I believe so, and these.
- MR. SPESIA: The way those records read, it's
- 18 like a computer printout. It will kind of --
- MR. OLESON: While you --
- MR. SPESIA: That there was a contact made.
- MR. OLESON: The people from the Wauconda
- office -- it's my understanding people from the

- 1 Wauconda office came in. I was notified by letter
- from Aqua from the customer service office in
- Pennsylvania, I guess, to the effect that they had to
- 4 come into my house to inspect this. So I allowed
- 5 this to happen. I got no report from the inspections
- that were made. So I want to know what they said in
- ⁷ those inspections, because it has an important part
- 8 to play as to how the charges can be interpreted. I
- 9 am one customer, one service line, two meters, and it
- appears to me that what's happening is that there is
- 11 a real question as to whether customers should be
- charged one water customer service charge or two. I
- am being charged two. There is also another
- statement in there about the -- how the meters are
- installed, and that allows a discount for a second
- meter. So there is a very important point here as to
- the interpretation of the tariff, which I'm not sure
- Mr. Blanchette is going to do anything but interpret
- 19 the -- that tariff to the benefit of Aqua as their
- customer service department has already done.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Oleson, if he does to your
- dissatisfaction interpret the tariff in such a way,

- you are perfectly free to come back here and pursue
- your remedy.
- MR. OLESON: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: And the tariff would -- obviously
- 5 is the issue.
- 6 MR. OLESON: Okay.
- 7 MR. SPESIA: This is actually an attempt at a
- 8 settlement discussion, and if things aren't resolved,
- 9 we will return to the process.
- JUDGE RILEY: That's exactly right. No one is
- going to be foreclosed their day in court.
- MR. OLESON: Okay. I understand that. I
- understand that.
- JUDGE RILEY: So why don't we do this? Why
- don't I just move this matter? I can set it -- we
- can set this down for a hearing date and build in
- enough time for you to meet with Mr. Blanchette and
- to see if you can obtain any satisfaction there at
- 19 all, and if not, then we can return here and pursue
- your remedy at the hearing process.
- MR. OLESON: Is Mr. Blanchette also going to be
- willing to talk to me then as to why I have a

- 485 percent bill for my household water comparing the
- old versus the new for 4,500 gallons? The new bill
- rate is 485 percent of the old rate. It is almost
- five times the bill I have paid previously. Is he
- 5 going to be able to discuss that issue as well when
- the average bill supposedly supplied to the ICC
- during the rate hearing case indicated substantially
- 8 less than that?
- 9 MR. SPESIA: I think you have kind of asked a
- 10 loaded question. So I will answer the question that
- I want to answer, which is he will bring your billing
- statements and will certainly discuss with you any
- issues about your billing.
- MR. OLESON: All right. Just so we make sure
- to understand, it's not a question of billing. I do
- have another detail as far as billing, because I
- don't think -- Agua interim rate change dates billing
- is not following the -- probably an ICC requirement.
- 19 However, when I say billing, I am talking about rate
- shock. I am talking about extreme increases in water
- cost, and I think that the presentation of the
- average bill that was used in that rate case, Aqua

- should have known that the revenue splits and the
- 2 charges would vary drastically on customers depending
- on the volume of water that they used. And he can
- 4 talk to me about it, but I think that this has to
- 5 have a hearing. I will meet with him and talk to him
- 6 about it.
- 7 MR. SPESIA: And that's certainly your
- 8 prerogative. So this isn't the trial right now. If
- 9 you want to sit down and talk to him, he will be
- prepared to talk about your issues that you raise in
- 11 your complaint.
- MR. OLESON: One thing I would like to clarify
- is that in discussions with Aqua customer service, I
- was told that I am being charged two customer service
- charges and two fire protection charges because I
- have two accounts. I would like to clarify that I
- have one service line that enters into my house.
- 18 Inside my house as one customer I have two meters.
- 19 The second meter was installed with Aqua's knowledge
- and approval as far as I know, and it's a --
- MR. SPESIA: You know, once again, this is not
- the formal record of the proceeding.

- MR. OLESON: I agree.
- MR. SPESIA: So I read what you are alleging
- here, and Mr. Blanchette has looked at it.
- JUDGE RILEY: What I was going to suggest is,
- okay, we have aired this out quite thoroughly. We
- understand your position, Mr. Oleson. See what
- satisfaction, if any, you can obtain from your
- 8 meeting with Mr. Blanchette, and in the meantime,
- 9 let's pick a date for the hearing so that if you are
- not satisfied with Mr. Blanchett's explanation, you
- can come back here and present your evidence.
- MR. OLESON: I would like -- if I am going to
- meet with Mr. Blanchette, besides those service
- records, I would like for him to be able to talk to
- me about this average bill that was used in the rate
- case that set these charges, because the average bill
- shows that they use the same amount of gallons for an
- average customer for the Ivanhoe Water Division and
- the Ivanhoe Sewer Division. This means that exactly
- the same average was used to present that information
- to the ICC for both sewer and water. Yet, we all
- 22 know that we have tremendous amounts of water that is

- not being treated for sewage, and you can't -- there
- was a mistake in that average bill. That average
- bill influenced the law judge in that case and then
- 4 probably influenced the commissioners when they voted
- 5 to approve this plan.
- So I am going to talk to him about the
- ⁷ average bill. I am going to talk to him about two
- 8 meters being installed and two water service charges.
- ⁹ I am going to talk to him about fire protection
- charges, one for my grass that I certainly think is
- absolutely ridiculous.
- JUDGE RILEY: Well, these are all valid points,
- 13 by all means.
- MR. OLESON: All right.
- JUDGE RILEY: What would be a good date for
- hearing? I want to build in enough time for you to
- meet with Mr. Blanchette and get the explanations
- that you seek.
- MR. SPESIA: Judge, are we going to work in
- time for submittal of testimony?
- JUDGE RILEY: Prefiled testimony?
- MR. SPESIA: Right.

- JUDGE RILEY: Yes. And Mr. Oleson, you can
- submit prefiled testimony if you so desire, or you
- 3 can --
- MR. OLESON: You are going to have to explain
- to me what you mean by prefiled testimony, because I
- 6 am basically new at this.
- JUDGE RILEY: Okay. What it amounts to is it
- is a written out question and answer form, questions
- 9 that you would ask yourself and that you would
- answer. And it is of any length. Just make sure
- that it covers your entire case, it provides all of
- the testimony that you want to put in, and then you
- would file that with the office of the chief clerk in
- 14 Springfield with a verification, and that would
- constitute your direct testimony.
- MR. OLESON: For each one of these issues I
- already have the bills that are associated with it,
- the relevant pages from the tariff and so on, and I
- have, for instance, a bill. Then my question is, you
- know, what it shows the two fire protection charges.
- How -- do I have to go into that kind of detail
- written out to provide?

- JUDGE RILEY: No, not necessarily. What you
- would do in a case like that is simply say that have
- you -- you know, you have these bills, that they are
- qoing to be entered into evidence, that they were
- submitted to you. They are for your account, that
- 6 kind of thing, but you don't have to repeat what is
- in the bill in the testimony. It doesn't have to be
- 8 set forth a second time.
- 9 MR. OLESON: Are you understanding? So it's a
- summary of the points then for each individual piece
- of evidence?
- JUDGE RILEY: I don't think I'm explaining this
- very well. It might be better for you simply to
- 14 forego the prefiled testimony and just bring -- just
- testify when you come to hearing, and I could guide
- you through.
- MR. OLESON: Okay. I mean, I feel like I have
- tried to work with this on various points in order
- 19 and --
- JUDGE RILEY: I understand that. But that does
- 21 not preclude Mr. Spesia from filing prefiled
- testimony.

- MR. OLESON: Fine.
- JUDGE RILEY: How long will that take you, Mr.
- 3 Spesia? Do you have any idea right now?
- MR. SPESIA: So he is not going to file any
- 5 direct testimony?
- JUDGE RILEY: It doesn't seem that way now, no.
- 7 MR. SPESIA: Okay. I guess I need to know how
- 8 soon -- I know Mr. Blanchette is going to be up in
- your area, he said, the next couple weeks. He is
- willing to meet with you. So if that can happen in
- the next couple weeks --
- MR. OLESON: I can meet with him prior to
- October 3rd, if you are talking in the next two
- weeks.
- MR. SPESIA: Okay. Yep. That will work.
- JUDGE RILEY: And then depending on what you
- learn, and assuming that we are going to go to an
- evidentiary hearing after that, counsel, can you put
- any timeframe at all on how much -- how long you are
- going to need to get prefiled testimony submitted to
- the clerk?
- MR. SPESIA: It's hard -- without, I guess,

- 1 getting any testimony from him, it's -- you know, if
- you can give me 30 days after the 3rd, because the
- 3 company may decide they are not going to submit
- anything prefiled either, and we will just come up
- 5 and have a hearing.
- JUDGE RILEY: Is Monday, November 5th good for
- ⁷ everyone? That's just over 30 days from now.
- 8 MR. OLESON: Fine.
- 9 JUDGE RILEY: Would that be fine?
- MR. SPESIA: That's fine.
- JUDGE RILEY: All right. Is 10:00 a.m. an
- agreeable starting time?
- MR. SPESIA: I'm sorry. So November 5th was
- ¹⁴ for --
- JUDGE RILEY: For an evidentiary hearing for
- 16 Docket 12-0483, and my next question was, is
- 10:00 a.m. an agreeable starting time? Can the
- parties make it here by 10:00 a.m.?
- MR. OLESON: Yes.
- MR. SPESIA: Yeah, that's fine, Judge.
- JUDGE RILEY: 10:00 a.m., okay. Then why don't
- we let it rest right there?

- 1 Mr. Oleson, you are going to meet
- sometime in the next two weeks with Mr. Blanchette
- from Aqua Illinois, and discuss all of the issues
- 4 that you have raised. If it's not to your
- satisfaction, we will proceed to an evidentiary
- 6 hearing, and I will have a notice sent confirming the
- ⁷ date and the time.
- 8 MR. SPESIA: Is there a phone number that you
- 9 can be contacted at, Mr. Oleson?
- MR. OLESON: (847) 949-1547.
- JUDGE RILEY: He has two phone numbers listed
- on his complaint.
- MR. OLESON: And you can use the cell phone
- number that's listed there as well.
- MR. SPESIA: Okay. Expect a call then from Mr.
- Blanchette.
- MR. OLESON: All right. I will. Now, as far
- as evidentiary information, I can give you a -- how
- would it be if I told you what I am looking at so
- that we can make this -- if you need -- I mean, I am
- looking basically at my bills, the -- your tariff
- sheets, letters that have been sent to me by Aqua, et

- cetera. That's basically where it's coming from on
- each of the points that I am -- that we are referring
- to, but I have got to show you my bills in order to
- 4 show you the extreme change in the charge, the fact
- 5 that there are two meter charges, the fact that there
- are two fire protection charges, et cetera. So I
- need to show you those bills, and it comes -- and the
- questions come from your tariff sheets.
- JUDGE RILEY: This is all something you can
- discuss with Mr. Spesia and Mr. Blanchette, you know,
- 11 on your own time. We are settled here. We have our
- date set, and we will proceed on November 5th in the
- absence of any kind of a satisfactory settlement for
- ¹⁴ you.
- MR. OLESON: All right.
- JUDGE RILEY: So I am just going to continue
- this matter to November 5th at 10:00 a.m. for an
- evidentiary hearing, and do the best you can in the
- meantime with Mr. Blanchette.
- MR. OLESON: Is there -- can you give me a
- little idea of an evidentiary hearing? It's my
- understanding that if this goes to an evidentiary

- hearing, I present information first.
- JUDGE RILEY: Right. You have the burden of
- ³ proof.
- 4 MR. OLESON: So basically I am going to ask
- 5 myself a question and answer the question and give my
- 6 view of it?
- JUDGE RILEY: Not necessarily. I will start
- you off with the questions.
- 9 MR. OLESON: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: And it will all pertain to the
- evidence you've got. What evidence do you have? You
- know, was it prepared by you? Was it received by
- you, that kind of thing, but you are not going to
- 14 have to sit there and ask yourself questions, no.
- All right. We are continued to
- 16 November 5th at 10:00 a.m. for an evidentiary
- hearing.
- 18 (Whereupon, the proceeding has
- been adjourned until November
- 5th at 10:00 a.m.)

21